

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAY 26 2009

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Patent Application of:

Inventor(s)	:	Pedlow, Jr., et al.
Filed	:	3/10/2004
Application No.	:	10/797,840
Confirmation No.	:	6433
Group Art Unit	:	4157
Examiner	:	Stanley, Mark P.
Docket Number	:	SNY-T5715.02
Title	:	Distribution of Preferences, Provisioning and Entitlements in Clustered Distributed Entertainment Networks

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING / FAX TRANSMISSION / ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. <input type="checkbox"/> transmitted electronically to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.	
Applicant, Assignee or Reg. Representative: Jerry A. Miller, Reg. No. 30779	
Signature: /Jerry A. Miller 30779/ Date: 5/26/2009	

PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned spoke with Examiner Stanley briefly at 3:00PM today regarding the present application. Mr. Stanley wishes to discuss the matter further later today including his supervisor. The issues raised were briefly as follows:

- Examiner Stanley clarified that in section 1, paragraph 43 of Giglio should be paragraphs 24 and 27.

Application No.: 10/797,840

- The undersigned is unable to find a teaching in Giglio of "wherein the DHCP services use DHCP option 43 to define a scope of the subscriber site in which the scope is defined to be equal to a maximum number of potential peer terminals at the subscriber site" (emphasis added). The DHCP services of Giglio cannot be found by the undersigned to disclose that the pool is equal to the above definition with reference to the subscriber site. Multiple references to this feature are present in the claims.
- The undersigned cannot find any indication in Mouko that the "including a number for the terminal wherein the number falls within the scope of the subscriber site" (emphasis added). The numbers used in Mouko are not explained as such.

The undersigned looks forward to addressing these issues in a further interview later today.

The undersigned additionally notes that many other distinctions exist between the cited art and the claims, but first wishes to resolve these and reserves the right to argue any of the points presented for the rejection of the dependent claims at a later date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jerry A. Miller 30779/

Jerry A. Miller
Registration No. 30,779

Dated: 5/26/2009.